arXiv:1501.02550v1 [math-ph] 12 Jan 2015

EQUIVALENCE OF TWO INVERSE BOUNDARY VALUE PROBLEMS FOR THE NAVIER-STOKES EQUATIONS

O. YU. IMANUVILOV AND M. YAMAMOTO

Abstract. In this note, we prove that for the Navier-Stokes equations, a pair of Dirichlet and Neumann data and pressure uniquely correspond to a pair of Dirichlet data and surface stress on the boundary. Hence the two inverse boundary value problems in [2] and [3] are the same.

In Imanuvilov and Yamamoto [2], we prove the global uniqueness in determining the viscosity $\mu(x)$ by all Cauchy data for the Navier-Stokes equations in two dimensions. More precisely we can state the result as follows. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be a bounded domain with smooth boundary $\partial\Omega$ and $\nu = (\nu_1, \nu_2)$ be the outward unit normal vector to $\partial\Omega$ and $\partial_\nu v = \nabla v \cdot \nu$. We set $x = (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and $\mathbb{N}_+ = \{0, 1, 2, 3, ...\}$, $\beta = (\beta_1, \beta_2) \in (\mathbb{N}_+)^2$, and $|\beta| = \beta_1 + \beta_2$, $\partial_x^\beta = \partial_1^{\beta_1}\partial_2^{\beta_2}$, $\partial_i = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}$, $i = 1, 2$. We consider the stationary Navier-Stokes equations:

$$G_\mu(x, D)(\mathbf{u}, p) := \left(\sum_{j=1}^{2} (-2\partial_j(\mu(x)\epsilon_{1j}(\mathbf{u})) + u_j\partial_j u_1) + \partial_1 p, \right.$$

$$\left. \sum_{j=1}^{2} (-2\partial_j(\mu(x)\epsilon_{2j}(\mathbf{u})) + u_j\partial_j u_2) + \partial_2 p \right) = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

where $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2)$ is a velocity field, p is a pressure and $\epsilon_{ij}(\mathbf{u}) = \frac{1}{2}(\partial_i u_j + \partial_j u_i)$. Let $\epsilon(\mathbf{u}) = (\epsilon_{ij}(\mathbf{u}))_{1 \le i,j \le 2}$.

We define the Dirichlet-to-Neumann map Λ_μ:

$$\Lambda_\mu(\mathbf{f}) = (\partial_\nu \mathbf{u}, p)|_{\partial\Omega},$$

where $G_\mu(x, D)(\mathbf{u}, p) = 0$ in Ω, $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{f}$ on $\partial\Omega$, $\operatorname{div}\mathbf{u} = 0$, $\mathbf{u} \in W_2^2(\Omega)$, $p \in W_2^1(\Omega)$, and

$$D(\Lambda_\mu) \subset \mathcal{X} = \left\{ \mathbf{f} \in W_2^{\frac{3}{2}}(\partial\Omega);\ \exists(\mathbf{w}, q) \in W_2^2(\Omega) \times W_2^1(\Omega), \Delta\mathbf{w} + \nabla q = 0, \quad \operatorname{div}\mathbf{w} = 0, \quad \mathbf{w}|_{\partial\Omega} = \mathbf{f} \right\}.$$

The global uniqueness was proved in [2]:

Theorem *We assume that* $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in C^{10}(\overline{\Omega})$, > 0 *on* $\overline{\Omega}$ *and* $\partial_x^\beta \mu_1 = \partial_x^\beta \mu_2$ *on* $\partial\Omega$ *for each multi-index* β *with* $|\beta| \le 10$. *If there exists a positive constant* δ *such that*

$$\Lambda_{\mu_1}(\mathbf{f}) = \Lambda_{\mu_2}(\mathbf{f}) \quad \forall \mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{X} \cap \{\|\mathbf{f}\|_{W_2^{\frac{3}{2}}(\partial\Omega)} \le \delta\},$$

Department of Mathematics, Colorado State University, 101 Weber Building, Fort Collins, CO 80523-1874, U.S.A. e-mail: `oleg@math.colostate.edu` Partially supported by NSF grant DMS 1312900.

Department of Mathematical Sciences, The University of Tokyo, Komaba, Meguro, Tokyo 153, Japan e-mail: `myama@ms.u-tokyo.ac.jp`.

then $\mu_1 = \mu_2$ *in* Ω.

After [2], the paper Lai, Uhlmann and Wang [3] appeared and proved the global uniqueness for an inverse boundary value problem for the same Navier-Stokes equations by using Cauchy data

$$(\mathbf{u}, \sigma(\mathbf{u}, p)\nu)|_{\partial\Omega},$$

where E_2 is the 2×2 identity matrix and the stress tensor $\sigma(\mathbf{u}, p)$ is defined by $\sigma(\mathbf{u}, p) = 2\mu(x)\epsilon(\mathbf{u}) - pE_2$. Our Cauchy data requires the information of the pressure p on $\partial\Omega$, and in [3], it is written that the measurement of p alone on $\partial\Omega$ is unnatural.

However the Cauchy data in [3] are equivalent to our data in [2]. More precisely

Lemma. *Let a subbounfary* Γ *of* $\partial\Omega$ *be described by* $\{(x_1, \gamma(x_1));\ x_1 \in I\}$ *with some open interval* I *and* $\gamma \in C^2(\overline{I})$. *Then there exists an invertible* 4×4 *matrix* $K(x) \in C^1(\overline{I})$ *such that*

$$K(x_1)\begin{pmatrix} \partial_1(\mathbf{u}|_\Gamma) \\ \sigma(\mathbf{u}, p)\nu \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \partial_1 u_1|_\Gamma \\ \partial_1 u_2|_\Gamma \\ \partial_2 u_1|_\Gamma \\ p|_\Gamma \end{pmatrix}, \quad x_1 \in I,$$

where $\mathbf{u} \in C^1(\overline{\Omega})$ *satisfies div* $\mathbf{u} = 0$ *on* $\partial\Omega$ *and* $p \in C(\overline{\Omega})$.

Dividing $\partial\Omega$ into several small subboundaries, in view of div $\mathbf{u} = 0$ on $\partial\Omega$, we see by the lemma that $(\mathbf{u}, \sigma(\mathbf{u}, p)\nu)|_{\partial\Omega}$ uniquely determines $(\mathbf{u}, \partial_\nu \mathbf{u}, p)|_{\partial\Omega}$, so that the inverse boundary value problem in [3] is the same as [2]. The same relation holds for the three dimensional case.

We note that also for the isotropic Lamé system, a pair of surface displacement and Neumann derivative uniquely corresponds to a pair of surface displacement and surface stress, which can be proved similarly to Lemma 6.1 in Ikehata, Nakamura and Yamamoto [1].

Proof. Without loss of generality, we can assume that Ω is located locally below $x_2 = \gamma(x_1)$ and so we have

$$\nu(x_1) = \frac{1}{\theta(x_1)}\begin{pmatrix} -\gamma'(x_1) \\ 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

where we set $\gamma'(x_1) = \frac{d\gamma}{dx_1}(x_1)$ and $\theta(x_1) = \sqrt{1 + \gamma'(x_1)^2}$. Here by the divergence free condition we have

$$(\partial_2 u_2)(x_1, \gamma(x_1)) = -(\partial_1 u_1)(x_1, \gamma(x_1)), \quad x_1 \in I.$$

Set $g(x_1) = u_1(x_1, \gamma(x_1))$ and $h(x_1) = u_2(x_1, \gamma(x_1))$. Therefore

$$(\partial_1 u_1)(x_1, \gamma(x_1)) + \gamma'(x_1)(\partial_2 u_1)(x_1, \gamma(x_1)) = g'(x_1) \tag{1}$$

and

$$(\partial_1 u_2)(x_1, \gamma(x_1)) - \gamma'(x)(\partial_1 u_1)(x_1, \gamma(x_1)) = h'(x_1). \tag{2}$$

On the other hand, by the definition, we have

$$\sigma(\mathbf{u}, p)\nu = \theta(x_1)^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} -2\gamma'\mu(\partial_1 u_1)(x_1, \gamma(x_1)) + \mu(\partial_1 u_2) + \mu(\partial_2 u_1) + p\gamma' \\ -2\mu(\partial_1 u_1)(x_1, \gamma(x_1)) - \gamma'\mu(\partial_1 u_2) - \gamma'\mu(\partial_2 u_1) - p \end{pmatrix}.$$

Setting $\begin{pmatrix} q_1(x_1) \\ q_2(x_1) \end{pmatrix} = \theta(x_1)\sigma(\mathbf{u}, p)\nu$ for $x_1 \in I$, we have

$$-2\gamma'\mu(\partial_1 u_1)(x_1, \gamma(x_1)) + \mu(\partial_1 u_2) + \mu(\partial_2 u_1) + p\gamma'(x_1, \gamma(x_1)) = q_1(x_1) \tag{3}$$

and

$$-2\mu(\partial_1 u_1)(x_1, \gamma(x_1)) - \mu\gamma'(\partial_1 u_2) - \mu\gamma'(\partial_2 u_1) - p(x_1, \gamma(x_1)) = q_2(x_1), \tag{4}$$

Setting $f_1(x_1) = (\partial_1 u_1)(x_1, \gamma(x_1))$, $f_2(x_1) = (\partial_1 u_2)(x_1, \gamma(x_1))$, $f_3(x_1) = (\partial_2 u_1)(x_1, \gamma(x_1))$ and $f_4(x_1) = p(x_1)$, we can rewrite (1) - (4) as

$$A(x_1) \begin{pmatrix} f_1 \\ f_2 \\ f_3 \\ f_4 \end{pmatrix} := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & \gamma' & 0 \\ -\gamma' & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -2\mu\gamma' & \mu & \mu & \gamma' \\ -2\mu & -\mu\gamma' & -\mu\gamma' & -1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} f_1 \\ f_2 \\ f_3 \\ f_4 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} g' \\ h' \\ q_1 \\ q_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad x_1 \in I.$$

Multiplying the fourth row of A with γ' and adding to the third row, we have

$$\det A = -\det \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & \gamma' \\ -\gamma' & 1 & 0 \\ -4\mu\gamma' & \mu(1 - |\gamma'|^2) & \mu(1 - |\gamma'|^2) \end{pmatrix} = (|\gamma'|^4 + 2|\gamma'|^2 + 1)\mu \neq 0.$$

Since $\theta(x_1) = \sqrt{1 + \gamma'(x_1)^2} > 0$ for $x_1 \in \overline{I}$, the invertibility of A completes the proof of the lemma.

REFERENCES

[1] M. Ikehata, G. Nakamura and M. Yamamoto, Uniqueness in inverse problems for the isotropic Lamé system, J. Math. Sci. Univ. of Tokyo **5** (1998), 627–692.

[2] O.Y. Imanuvilov and M. Yamamoto, Global uniqueness in inverse boundary value problems for Navier-Stokes equations and Lamé system in two dimensions, to appear in Inverse Problems 2014.

[3] R.Y. Lai, G. Uhlmann and J.-N. Wang, Inverse boundary value problem for the Stokes and the Navier-Stokes equations in the plane, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal., Digital Object Identifier (DOI) 10.1007/s00205-014-0794-1